

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were pending in the present application prior to this response. Claims 1-19 were rejected. Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 14, 18 and 19 have been amended herein. Claim 15 has been canceled herein. Claims 20-22 have been added to the application. Reconsideration of all rejected claims is requested.

I Objection to the abstract of the disclosure

The abstract of the disclosure has been amended and now overcomes the objection.

II Objection to claim 11

Claim 11 has been amended to provide antecedent basis for "said state of said pins" as the Office Action required.

III Rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 8, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tsai et al. (U.S. 6,192,420).

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 is directed toward:

A USB device, comprising:
a lookup table in fixed electronically readable medium comprising a plurality of product identification information entries;
an electronically readable index that selects one of said

plurality of product identification information entries; and,
vendor identification information stored in a location separate from said index.

Some portions of claim 1 that are not disclosed by Tsai have been replicated above in bold type.

Tsai reads vendor and product information from an interface (22). More specifically, the interface (22) reads a plurality of voltages that are set by the physical connections of diodes or other switches to the interface (22). The reading function of Tsai is described at column 2, line 65 to column 3, line 1, which is replicated as follows:

The controller comprises a micro-controller (12), a USB module(13), an input bus (14), and a VIDS pin as an output pin to set up a plurality of vendor and product identification code.

Thus, both the vendor and product identification codes are established via the settings of the diodes. Other embodiments of Tsai use switches other than diodes, but both the vendor and product identification codes are established by setting the same switches.

Claim 1, on the other hand, is directed, in part, toward, "an electronically readable index that selects one of said plurality of product identification information entries." Claim 1 includes an additional element of "vendor identification information stored in a location separate from said index." Accordingly, the index for the lookup table and the vendor identification information are separate. As set forth above, Tsai discloses a system wherein the vendor and product information are indexed together.

Accordingly, Tsai does not disclose all the elements of claim 1. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIM 8

Claim 8 is independent and is directed toward:

A method of providing identification information on a USB capable device, comprising:

- reading an index;
- looking-up a product identification in electronically readable fixed medium based upon said index;
- reading a vendor identification from electronically readable fixed medium, said electronically readable fixed medium being separate from said index.**

Some portions of claim 8 that are not disclosed by Tsai have been replicated above in bold type.

Claim 8 was rejected on the same grounds as claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants incorporate the rebuttals to the rejection of claim 1 into this rebuttal.

As set forth above, Tsai discloses reading product and identification information from the same source, which may be the interface (22) of Fig. 2.

Claim 8, on the other hand, reads an index and vendor identification from separate sources. More specifically, claim 8 is, in part, directed toward “reading a vendor identification from electronically readable fixed medium, said electronically readable fixed medium being separate from said index.”

Accordingly, Tsai does not disclose all the elements of claim 8. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIM 14

Claim 14 is independent and is directed toward:

14. An apparatus, comprising:
a USB interface;
a lookup table in fixed electronically readable medium supplying product identification information to said USB interface;
means for supplying an index into said lookup table to choose said product identification information from a plurality of product identification information entries; and
vendor identification information located separate from said means for supplying an index.

Some portions of claim 14 that are not disclosed by Tsai have been replicated above in bold type.

Claim 14 was rejected on the same grounds as claims 1 and 8. Therefore, the Applicants incorporate the rebuttals to the rejections of claims 1 and 8 into this rebuttal.

As set forth above, Tsai discloses reading product and identification information from the same source, which may be the interface (22) of Fig. 2.

Claim 14, on the other hand, reads an index and vendor identification from separate sources. More specifically, claim 14 is, in part, directed toward “vendor identification information located separate from said means for supplying an index.”

Accordingly, Tsai does not disclose all the elements of claim 14. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

IV Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12-19 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12-19 were rejected under §35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresemann et al., (US 2003/0005274 A1) in view of what is well known in the art, as evidenced by Tsai.

The Applicants note that Bresemann is not a proper reference. The filing date of Bresemann is July 3, 2002 and the filing date of the Applicants' application is January 31, 2001.

In addition, the Applicants respectfully reject the use of any earlier filing dates for Bresemann as it was filed as a continuation-in-part application. Accordingly, material in Bresemann cited by the Office Action may not have the benefit of the earlier filing date.

In the alternative, the Applicants will show that Bresemann cannot render the aforementioned claims obvious.

Should this rejection be maintained, the Applicants request that a proper reference be cited.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 is directed toward:

A USB device, comprising:
a lookup table in fixed electronically readable medium comprising a plurality of product identification information entries;
an electronically readable index that selects one of said plurality of product identification information entries; and,
vendor identification information stored in a location separate from said index.

Some portions of claim 1 that are not disclosed by Bresemann have been replicated above in bold type.

As with the Tsai reference, Bresemann does not disclose, among other elements of claim 1, “vendor identification information stored in a location separate from said index.” It is noted that Tsai did not disclose this element of claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Bresemann, Tsai, nor their combination can render claim 1 obvious. In addition, the Applicants reiterate that the Bresemann reference is not a proper reference for rendering claim 1 obvious.

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 2 and 4-6

Claims 2 and 4-6 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Accordingly, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

CLAIM 8

Claim 8 is independent and is directed toward:

A method of providing identification information on a USB capable device, comprising:

reading an index;

looking-up a product identification in electronically readable fixed medium based upon said index;

reading a vendor identification from electronically readable fixed medium, said electronically readable fixed medium being separate from said index.

Some portions of claim 8 that are not disclosed by Bresemann have been replicated above in bold type.

As with the Tsai reference, Bresemann does not disclose, among other elements

of claim 8, "reading a vendor identification from electronically readable fixed medium, said electronically readable fixed medium being separate from said index" The Applicants note that Tsai did not disclose this element of claim 8.

Accordingly, neither Bresemann, Tsai, nor their combination can render claim 8 obvious. In addition, the Applicants reiterate that the Bresemann reference is not a proper reference for rendering claim 8 obvious.

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 9, 10, 12, and 13

Claims 9, 10, 12, and 13 are dependent on claim 8 and are allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Accordingly, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections

CLAIM 14

Claim 14 is directed toward:

An apparatus, comprising:
a USB interface;
a lookup table in fixed electronically readable medium supplying product identification information to said USB interface;
means for supplying an index into said lookup table to choose said product identification information from a plurality of product identification information entries; and
vendor identification information located separate from said means for supplying an index.

Some portions of claim 14 that are not disclosed by Bresemann have been replicated above in bold type.

As with the Tsai reference, Bresemann does not disclose, among other elements of claim 14, “vendor identification information located separate from said means for supplying an index.” It is noted that Tsai did not disclose this element of claim 14.

Accordingly, neither Bresemann, Tsai, nor their combination can render claim 14 obvious. In addition, the Applicants reiterate that the Bresemann reference is not a proper reference for rendering claim 14 obvious.

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 16-19

Claims 16-19 are dependent on claim 14 and are allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Accordingly, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

V Rejection of Claims 3 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresemann in view of Baldwin (U.S. 5,042,265).

Claims 3 and 11 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Accordingly, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

VI Rejection of Claims 1 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambeth (U.S. 6023736) in view of what is known in the art, as evidenced by Tsai.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 is replicated again for convenience as follows:

Claim 1 is directed toward:

A USB device, comprising:
a lookup table in fixed electronically readable medium comprising a plurality of product identification information entries;
an electronically readable index that selects one of said plurality of product identification information entries; and,
vendor identification information stored in a location separate from said index.

Some portions of claim 1 that are not disclosed by Lambeth, Tsai, or their combination have been replicated above in bold type.

Lambeth does not disclose “an electronically readable index that selects one of said plurality of product identification information entries” as claimed in claim 1. Furthermore, Lambeth does not disclose “vendor identification information stored in a location separate from said index” as claimed in claim 1. As set forth above, these elements are not disclosed by Tsai.

Accordingly, neither Lambeth, Tsai, nor their combination can render claim 1 obvious. The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claim 7

Claim 7 is allowable by way of its dependence on claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

Dated: Sept. 17, 2003

By:

RW Nelson

Robert W. Nelson
Reg. No. 37,898
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, CO 80202
Tel: (303) 298-9888
Fax: (303) 297-2266